

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

David Boies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
Tel: (914) 749-8200
dboies@bsfllp.com

Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165
Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027
Erika Nyborg-Burch, CA Bar No. 342125
44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel.: (415) 293-6800
mmao@bsfllp.com
brichardson@bsfllp.com
enyborg-burch@bsfllp.com

James Lee (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Rossana Baeza (admitted *pro hac vice*)
100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor
Miami, FL 33131
Tel.: (305) 539-8400
jlee@bsfllp.com
rbaeza@bsfllp.com

Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334
725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel.: (213) 995-5720
alanderson@bsfllp.com

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

William C. Carmody (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Shawn J. Rabin (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Steven M. Shepard (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Alexander Frawley (admitted *pro hac vice*)
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Tel.: (212) 336-8330
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
srabin@susmangodfrey.com
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com

Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: (310) 789-3100
abonn@susmangodfrey.com

MORGAN & MORGAN

John A. Yanchunis (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Ryan J. McGee (admitted *pro hac vice*)
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Tel.: (813) 223-5505
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
rmcgee@forthepeople.com

Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: (415) 358-6913
mram@forthepeople.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO
individually and on behalf of all similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**DECLARATION OF MARK MAO IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE
TO GOOGLE'S JULY 27
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION (DKT.
642)**

DECLARATION OF MARK MAO

1
2 1. I am a partner with the law firm of Boies Schiller Flexner LLP, counsel for Plaintiffs
3 in this matter. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice before all courts of the State of
4 California. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein and am competent to testify.

5 2. I submit this Declaration in response to the Court ordering Plaintiffs to respond to
6 Google's July 27, 2022 Administrative Motion (Dkts. 642, 647).

7 3. The parties have engaged in numerous meet-and-confer sessions—with and
8 without Special Master Brush—relating to their disputes over Google's preservation obligations.

9 4. Plaintiffs since the outset of this case have repeatedly requested that Google
10 preserve all data reflecting its collection, storage, and use of private browsing information.

11 5. On March 14, 2022, Google for the first time proposed a sampling approach to
12 preservation.

13 6. On March 15, Google provided a written sampling proposal. On March 22, Google
14 provided additional details regarding its proposal. None of Google's proposals in any way
15 suggested that Google would encounter design or implementation challenges.

16 7. All along, Plaintiffs objected to Google's proposal to preserve only sampled data,
17 continuing to insist that Google preserve all data relating to its collection, storage, and use of
18 private browsing data.

19 8. Plaintiffs were not aware of the possibility of Google's design and implementation
20 challenges (addressed in Google's July 27 Administrative Motion, Dkt. 642) until Google
21 contacted Plaintiffs on July 26 to inform Plaintiffs of its intention to file that motion.

22 9. Counsel for the parties met and conferred on July 27 before Google filed its
23 Administrative Motion. During that meet and confer, Google's counsel represented that Google
24 needed more time to design the preservation mechanism and even more time to conduct the
25 backfill. Google did not identify any other issues with the Court-ordered preservation plan.

26 10. During the meeting, Plaintiffs also asked Google how the relief Google is seeking
27 impacts Google's preservation of data within the additional logs that contain Incognito-detection
28

bits, as disclosed in Google's June 14, 2022 Declaration of Martin Sramek. Dkt. 614-2. Google did not provide any response, stating that Google will address those logs in its August 18 opposition to Plaintiffs' forthcoming August 4 request for additional sanctions. *See* Dkt. 624 (setting a briefing schedule for Plaintiffs' forthcoming motion relating to the information disclosed in the June 14 Sramek Declaration).

11. On July 28, in connection with preparing their response to Google's Administrative Motion, Plaintiffs emailed Google nine follow-up questions relating to the substance of Google's July 27 Administrative Motion, including:

- a. When Google began its efforts to design what is described in its Motion;
- b. How much time Google engineers have devoted to designing, testing, and implementing what is described in its Motion;
- c. What resources are available, but have not been utilized, to assist with designing, testing, and implementing what is described in its Motion;
- d. How Google determined the timelines for its requested extensions;
- e. When Google identified other problems with complying with the Court-ordered preservation plan, like those with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED];
- f. What Google has done to since investigate how it could resolve those problems;
- g. How Google intends to sample the log sources to ensure the sampling relates to the same users, instead of different users, across the log sources;
- h. Why Google is not saving all [REDACTED], particularly data related to the `is_chrome_incognito` Incognito-detection bit; and
- i. Identifying any additionally responsive [REDACTED] that are not being saved that would otherwise be subject to Google's preservation obligations.

12. On July 29, Plaintiffs followed up on these requests, and counsel for Google responded merely to state that Google would provide written responses on Monday, August 1.

1 Plaintiffs then asked for Google to provide rolling responses prior to August 1 so that Plaintiffs
2 have time to consider Google's responses before filing their own response, due August 1.

3 13. As of this filing, completed after the close of business on the East Coast, Google
4 has not provided a response to any of Plaintiffs' questions.

5 14. Google has yet produced to Plaintiffs any of the data or encryption keys that Google
6 is required to preserve under the Court's May 20 Preservation Order (Dkt. 587), nor have any of
7 Google's experts addressed that data in their reports. Google has not provided any information to
8 Plaintiffs, formally through discovery or otherwise, regarding Google's sample-selection process.
9

10 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
11 foregoing is true and correct.

12 Executed this 1st day of August, 2022, at San Francisco, California.

13
14 /s/ Mark Mao